



APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	------------------

09/216,859 12/21/98 HRADIL

G 1924/00003

EXAMINER

IM22/0323

POLLOCK VANDE SANDE & AMERNICK
SUITE 800
1990 M STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20036-3425

VALENTINE, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1741

DATE MAILED: 03/23/00

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES--

Art Unit: 1741

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hough et al.

See Figures.

If not shown by the reference, then the claim would be considered as readable on the reference because the structure shown by the reference (see items 94, 52, 28 in figure 2) is

Art Unit: 1741

“capable” of operating in the sense of applicant’s claim. Statements of intended use are not given weight when considering the patentability of apparatus claims.

4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wurster et al.
See Figures 5, 7, 14, 16 and col. 8, lines 20-68.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims appear to rely upon the materials being operated upon the structure is defined in terms of the materials contained within the structure. The workpieces and the fluids are impositive elements of structure and should be recited as having an impositive relationship to the apparatus elements.

Art Unit: 1741

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3-22 and 24-30 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
8. Claim 23 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The references of record do not show an apparatus with a vessel having at least one bottom wall inclined downwardly from one side wall to an inlet; an electrode spaced above a counter electrode, a pump means for conveying fluid into the inlet from a container and a control valve for controlling fluid from the container into the inlet; and a frame for engaging and supporting the apparatus portably enabling transfer between a plurality of containers.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Greenberg, Prillig et al, and Christini et al show flow patterns in apparatus which are created by structural elements within the devices.

Art Unit: 1741

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald R. Valentine, whose telephone number is (703) 308-3327. The fax number for this group is (703) 305-3599.

drv

March 21, 2000



DONALD R. VALENTINE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1100

1741